

Application No. 10/042,658

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The above-identified patent application has been reviewed in light of the Examiner's Action dated June 7, 2005. Claims 1, 14, 18, 25, and 27 have been amended without intending to abandon or to dedicate to the public any patentable subject matter. Accordingly, Claims 1-29 are now pending.

The Examiner has objected to the drawings for being informal. Attached hereto are formalized drawings which Applicant believes are in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d). Accordingly, withdrawal of the objections to the drawings is respectfully requested.

Claim 27 was objected to for being indefinite. In light of the Examiner's comments, Claim 27 has been amended to correct the aspects of that claim found to be indefinite. Specifically, the occurrence of "a second language" has been amended to read, "said second language." The objection to Claim 27 should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 1, 3-6, 9-14, 18-22, and 24-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,416,903 to Malcolm ("Malcolm.") In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) to be proper, each and every element as set forth in the claim must be found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. (MPEP § 2131.) However, each and every element of the claims cannot be found in the Malcolm reference. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 1, 3-6, 9-14, 18-22, and 24-29 are respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 7, 8, 15-17, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Malcolm in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,526,426 to Larkitz ("Larkitz"). In order for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) to be proper three criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art references must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. (MPEP §2143.) However, neither Malcolm nor Larkitz teach, suggest or describe all of the claims limitations. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of Claims 2, 7, 8, 15-17, and 23 are respectfully requested.

The Malcolm reference is generally directed to a system and method for supporting translations of a windowed user interface. Malcolm dynamically generates subscreens, which conform to a given country's language requirement. The subscreens support translation to and from an initial language to a second language. Information containing specific comments

Application No. 10/042,658

pertaining to a given field or tab can be appended to the file containing the text to be displayed. (Malcolm, col. 3, ll. 1-11.) More particularly, update tables can be populated to help keep translators updated and thus facilitates parallel translation by multiple users. However, there is no teaching, suggestion, or description in Malcolm of displaying first language text to the translator in the context that the first language text will be seen by an end user of the computer program. Missing this step creates a possibility that the translator will mis-translate something because he/she was not aware of the context in which the word to be translated was to be used. This increases the amount of time spent translating a given piece of text or creates the possibility that a mistranslated product will be delivered to market. Furthermore, Malcolm does not teach, suggest, or describe displaying the translated text to the translator in the context that particular translated text will be seen by an end user. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, the rejections of the claims as anticipated by or obvious over the Malcolm reference should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The Larkitz reference is generally directed toward a translation management system. In particular the system utilizes a configuration of databases, visitors, developers, and workflow managers to increase the efficiency of translating a given source document to multiple final different languages. The system uses an interface that enables a translator to incrementally update the language content of a Web site or document. (Larkitz, col. 2, ll. 11-17.) The system can automatically detect when a document or site has been changed and notifies the translator that such a change has occurred. This helps maintain an up-to-date translated document or Web site. However, Larkitz does not teach, suggest, or describe displaying either the first language text or the translated text to the translator during the process of translation in the context as it will be seen by the end user. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, the rejections of the claims as being obvious over Malcolm in view of Larkitz should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 1 is generally directed to a method for translating source text of a computer program. As amended, Claim 1 recites in part, "recording a status of a translation of said first record into a second natural language, wherein said first record containing source text is not a finalized version of said source text, and wherein said at least a first record containing source text in a first natural language is displayed to a translator as said first record containing source text in a first natural language will be seen by a user of said computer program." Support for the amendments to Claim 1 can be found in the specification, for example at page 5, ll. 3-8; page 6, ll. 16-20; page 22, ll. 14-16; and page 36, ll. 11-22. As noted above, there is no teaching, suggestion or disclosure in Malcolm of displaying a first record to a translator in the context as it

Application No. 10/042,658

would be seen by the end user of the computer program. In particular, Malcolm only discloses a method of translating where the translation occurs only on the source code and the translator does not have the first record in a context of the user interface or displayed output of the computer program. Furthermore, the secondary reference, Larkitz, does not teach, suggest or describe displaying a first record to a translator in the context as it would be seen by the end user of a computer program. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Claim 1 and dependent Claims 2-13 are not anticipated by Malcolm or obvious over Malcolm in view of Larkitz, and the rejections of these claims should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 14 is generally directed to a system that facilitates the translation of a computer program. As amended Claim 14 recites in part, "a first edit box, wherein at least a first of said portions of text written in said first natural language and included in said current version of said computer program." Claim 14 further recites "a second edit box, wherein a translation of said at least a first of said portions of text written in said first natural language and displayed in said first edit box into a second natural language can be entered, wherein said translation of said at least a first of said portions of text into a second natural language is stored as part of a target computer program, and wherein said at least a first portion of text written in said first natural language and said at least a first portion of text into said second natural language are displayed to a translator in a context that would be seen by an end user of said computer program." As noted above neither Malcolm nor Larkitz teach, suggest, or describe having portions of text written in a first natural language or a translated second natural language appear to the translator in the context that the final user sees. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Claim 14 and dependent Claims 15-17 are not anticipated by Malcolm or obvious over Malcolm in view of Larkitz, and the rejections of these claims should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 18 is generally directed to a method for developing multiple natural language versions of software by translation. As amended Claim 18 recites in part, "displaying said at least a first component of said software translated into said second language in the context of said first component's usage in said target software program." As noted above, neither Malcolm nor Larkitz teach, suggest, or describe displaying a component of the translated text to the translator in the context of the target software program. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Claim 18 and dependent Claims 19-24 are not anticipated by Malcolm or obvious over Malcolm in view of Larkitz, and the rejections of these claims should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 25 is generally directed to a method for developing computer software. As amended, Claim 25 recites in part, "translating said first textual content into a second language,

Application No. 10/042,658

wherein said translated first textual content is displayed in said first format, and wherein said first format is the format in which said first textual content will appear to an end user of said computer software." Neither Malcolm or Larkitz teach, suggest, or describe a method of translating software where textual content will be displayed to a translator in the same format as it will appear to an end user of the software thereby assisting in a more efficient and accurate translation. Accordingly, Claim 25 and dependent Claim 26-29 are not anticipated by Malcolm or obvious over Malcolm in view of Larkitz, and the rejections of these claims should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

The application now appearing to be in form for allowance, early notification of the same is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if doing so would expedite the resolution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.

By: 

Matthew R. Ellsworth
Registration No. 56,345
1560 Broadway, Suite 1200
Denver, Colorado 80202-5141
(303) 863-9700

Date: 9/6/05